



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/545,707	04/07/2000	Sundaram Ramakesavan	42390.P8181	1262

7590 08/26/2003

David Kaplan
Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, LE V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	

DATE MAILED: 08/26/2003

13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/545,707	RAMAKESAVAN, SUNDARAM <i>M</i>
	Examiner Le Nguyen	Art Unit 2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 July 2003.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-9 and 11-23 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-9 and 11-23 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____. 6) Other:

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to Amendment C, filed 7/24/03.
2. Claims 1-9 and 11-23 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 8, 16 and 18 are independent claims and claim 10 has been canceled.
3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. Claims 1-9 and 11-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Wagner et al. (“Wagner”, US 6,169,911 B1).

As per claim 1, Wagner teaches a method of mapping electronic devices coupled to a wireless network comprising:

- (a) displaying a first list of names of a plurality of electronic devices coupled to the wireless network on a display screen of a first electronic device coupled to the wireless network (fig. 3A, “*Address Book*”);
- (b) displaying a visual cue on the display screen in response to receiving a wireless identification signal from a second electronic device, the cue identifying a default name associated with the second electronic device in the first list of names of electronic devices (col. 6, lines 40-41; *an identification signal such as a telephone number from a second electronic device associated with the first electronic device “Address Book” appears in the display screen*); and

(c) providing automatically an option on the first electronic device to rename the default name associated with the second electronic device to a local name (col. 4, lines 55-58; *user may access various functions of a telephone address book such as inherent functions of editing/renaming an address book*).

As per claim 2, Wagner teaches the method of mapping electronic devices coupled to a wireless network comprising an option to send a wireless identification signal from the first electronic device to the second electronic device to cause a visual cue to be displayed on a display screen of the second electronic device, the cue identifying a default name associated with the first electronic device in a second list of names of a plurality of electronic devices coupled to the wireless network (*claim 2 is similar in functionality as claim 1 except in reverse; therefore, the second electronic device of the same network has the same capabilities as the first electronic device*).

As per claim 3, Wagner teaches the method of mapping electronic devices coupled to a wireless network comprising an option to send a wireless activation signal to a user-selected electronic device from the first list of names of electronic devices, the activation signal to cause the user-selected electronic device to identify itself using an audio or visual cue (figs. 3A and 4; *upon receiving a signal from another electronic device, a visual cue "Sue Smith" is displayed*).

Claim 4 is similar in scope to claim 3 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 5, Wagner teaches the method of mapping electronic devices coupled to a wireless network comprising providing a data exchange option on the first electronic device to send a file to the second electronic device, the data exchange option identifying the second

electronic device by the local name (*see figs. 5, 8 and respective portions of the specification; stock information and stock quotes are sent in batch files over the wireless networking device*).

As per claim 6, Wagner teaches the method of mapping electronic devices coupled to a wireless network wherein displaying the first list of names is done in response to a user of the first electronic device selecting a wireless network mapping menu option (fig 3A; *selecting an address book*).

Claim 7 is similar in scope to claim 1, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 8 is similar in scope to the combination of claims 3 and 5 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 9 is similar in scope to claim 1(b) and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 11 is similar in scope to claim 12 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 12 is similar in scope to claim 5 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 13 is similar in scope to claim 6 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 14 is similar in scope to claim 1(c) and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 15 is similar in scope to claim 8, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 16 is similar in scope to claim 1(b), and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 17 is similar in scope to claim 3 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 18 is similar in scope to claim 1, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 19, which is dependent on claim 18, is similar in scope to claim 2 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 20 is similar in scope to claim 3 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 21 is similar in scope to claim 4 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 22 is similar in scope to claim 5 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 23 is similar in scope to claim 6 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 7/24/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argued the following:

Wagner fails to teach or suggest automatically providing an option to rename the default name.

The Examiner disagrees for the following reasons:

The claim language cites the option of renaming a default name at users' discretion.

Wagner teaches an option of providing automatically for the users to rename a default name at users' discretion (col. 4, lines 55-58). Therefore, Wagner does teach the option in accordance with the definition in the specification on pages 11-12.

Inquires

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lê Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-7601. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 5:30 am to 2:00 pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (703) 308-0640.

Art Unit: 2174

The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703) 746-7238 [After Final Communication]

(703) 746-7239 [Official Communication]

(703) 746-7240 [For status inquiries, Draft Communication]

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Lê Nguyen
Patent Examiner
August 22, 2003

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100